

EA



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,863	10/31/2003	David R. Hall	66.0038	2862
26932	7590	08/04/2005	EXAMINER	
JEFFREY E. DALY GRANT PRIDECO, L.P. 400 N. SAM HOUSTON PARKWAY EAST SUITE 900 HOUSTON, TX 77060			NEUDER, WILLIAM P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3672	
DATE MAILED: 08/04/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/605,863

Applicant(s)

HALL ET AL.

Examiner

William P. Neuder

Art Unit

3672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/1/04, 4/13/04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: Each claim can contain only one capitalized word. Therefore, "The" on line 12 should be changed to -- the--. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1,2,6-11 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Denison et al 4,095,865.

Denison discloses a transmission line 10,14 for transmitting information in a downhole tool. The downhole tool has a pin 8 and box 7 end with a central bore 19 between the ends. Transmission cable 10,14 has a transmission line routed through a protective conduit (see the line bridging columns 1 and 2). The insulated cable is routed through the central bore and through channels formed in the pin and box ends. The conduit is elastically forced into a non-linear path 14 through the central bore by elastically confining the cable to a length within the central bore shorter than the length

Art Unit: 3672

of the conduit. As to claims 2 and 11, the non-linear path is spiral. As to claims 6 and 15, the spiral portion 14 is urged against the interior surface of the bore (see col. 2, lines 45-50). As to claims 7 and 16, the conduit is configured to stay against the borehole wall when the tool bends. As to claims 8 and 17, an insulated electrical conduit is considered a coaxial cable. As to claims 9 and 18, the ends of the cable 10 are fixed in the pin and box ends. As to method claim 10, the cable is routed through the pin and box end channels and elastically forced to fit within the bore of the tool that is shorter than the length of the conduit.

Claims 1,2 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hall et al 2005/0045339

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Hall discloses a transmission line 30 that fits into channels in the pin 34 and box ends (see figure 2). The transmission line is routed through the pin and box ends and is elastically forced into a non-linear path 28 within the central bore. As to claim 2, the path is spiral. As to claim 6, the conduit 28 is urged against the interior surface of the tool. As to claim 7, the conduit is shaped to stay in contact even if the tool bends. As to

Art Unit: 3672

claim 8, the transmission line is a coaxial cable. As to claim 9, the ends of the transmission line are fixed in the pin and box ends.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 3-5, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hall et al 2005/0045339 in view of Hall et al 2005/0067159.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2). Hall 2005/0045339 is considered to disclose all of the claimed features except for narrowing the diameter of the protective conduit. Hall 2005/0067159 teaches that it is known to narrow the diameter of the protective conduit in coaxial cables so that independent motion between the cables is abated. It would have been considered obvious to narrow the diameter of the coaxial cable of Hall et al 2005/0045339 as taught by Hall et al 2005/0067159 for the purpose of prohibiting independent motion between the cables. As to claims 4 and

Art Unit: 3672

20, the narrowed diameter provides additional stiffness. As to claim 5, the stiffened portion is less subject to deformation due to downhole conditions. As to claim 19, Hall teaches all of the claimed method except for narrowing of the cable. Again, it would be considered obvious to narrow the cable of Hall as taught by Hall to abate independent movement.

Claims 3-5, 12-14, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Denison et al in view of Hall et al 2005/0067159.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2). Denison is considered to disclose all of the claimed features (see above) except for narrowing the protective


Art Unit: 3672

conduit. Hall et al teaches that it is known to narrow the diameter of the protective conduit to abate motion between the cables. It would have been considered obvious to narrow the protective sheath of Denison to abate motion between the cables as taught by hall et al. As to claims 4,13 and 20, the narrowing of the conduit increases the stiffness. As to claims 5 and 14, the stiffened conduit is less subject to deformation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William P. Neuder whose telephone number is 571-272-7032. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David J. Bagnell can be reached on 571-272-6999. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
William P Neuder  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3672

W.P.N.